appliances in connection with which he is required to labor, and it appears that he fully comprehends and appreciates the nature and extent of the danger, he will be deemed to have assumed all risks incident to the service under such circumstances. *Conley v. American Express Co.*, 87 Me. 352; *Marsh v. Chickering*, 101 N. Y. 396. *Meador v. Lake Shore and Mich. South. Ry. Co.* 138 Indiana 290, holds that where an employe, whose duties require him to use a ladder, discovers that the ladder is defective and dangerous, and notifies the master, who promises to furnish another, but before doing so the employee, in using the defective ladder is injured, the master is not liable, although the service in which the ladder was used was of a kind which could not be postponed. A workman is under no obligation to continue working in a dangerous place of employment. If he does so, with every opportunity to know the danger he cannot excuse his own want of care in failing to notice and guard against it, by alleging that his employer promised to do this and had failed to observe his promise. *Reese v. Clark*, 146 Pa. 465. *Snowberg v. Nelson—Spencer Paper Company*, 43 Minn. 532, holds, however, like the case in point, that the alleged promise of the defendant to remedy the defects and his request to plaintiff to continue using the machinery until he should remedy it, brings the case within the recognized exception to he general rule that a servant who uses defective machinery, knowing of the defects, and the consequent danger, does so at his own risk. *St. Clair Nail Co. v. Smith*, 43 Ill. App. 105, and *T. & N. O. Ry. Co. v. Bingle*, 9 Texas Civil App. 322 are also in point.

MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS—EMPLOYEES—COMPENSATION—MAY V. CITY OF CHICAGO—78 N. E. REP. 912 (ILL.) A regular employe in the Collector's office did extra work for which he was promised extra compensation by the Collector. *Held*, that he was not entitled to it.

Employes in a city department are not entitled to extra compensation even though detailed and requested by the head officer of such department. *Bruns v. City of New York*, 6 Daly (N. Y.) 156; *Merzback v. City of New York*, 30 N. Y. Supp. 908. By the doing of extra work in making a digest of the laws, an attorney for the city cannot recover extra compensation. *Hays v. City of Oil City*, 11 Atl. 63; or other extra work. *People v. Supervisors*, 1 Hill (N. Y.) 362. When a Solicitor does extra professional work he does acquire the right to additional compensation, *City of Baltimore v. Ritchie*, 51 Md. 233, the same being held when a health officer performed extra duties, *Wendell v. City of Brooklyn*, 29 Barb (N. Y.) 204; and also in the case of a city treasurer for extra work, *City of Covington v. Maybury*, 9 Bush (Ky.) 304. A person accepting a public office at a fixed salary cannot claim additional compensation for extra work even though promised by a committee. *Evans v. City of Trenton*, 4 Zab (24 N. J. L.) 764. It has been held, however, that when a clerk does extra work, the additional sum so earned, is treated as an increase in salary which is allowed, providing the head officer of the department keeps his expenses within the limits of the appropriation. *People v. Corwin* 29 N. Y. Supp. 1077. Where duties are foreign to those for which he was employed he can recover for such extra work. *City of Detroit v. Redfield*, 19 Mich. 376.

NEGLIGENCE—DANGEROUS MACHINERY—CARE REQUIRED—PLACES ATTRACTIVE TO CHILDREN. MCALLISTER V. SEATTLE BREWING AND MALTING CO., 87 PAC. 68 (WASH.) *Held*, that where dangerous machinery of a character